

Executive Registry
75 - 8320/9

DCI/IC-75-3930
29 October 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Comments on Redraft of New E.O. on PABFIC
(Successor to PFIAB)

1. Attached for your signature is a letter to Jack Marsh (Tab A) commenting on his memorandum of 24 October and its enclosed redraft of the proposed Executive Order on the President's Advisory Board on the Foreign Intelligence Community at Tab E.

2. Wording of this redraft E.O. differs in only very minor ways from the draft you reviewed ten days ago. Regretfully, none of your 20 October comments on the 15 October draft are directly reflected in the redraft, although changes in wording have clarified some of the same portions of the E.O. on which you had proposed amendments. A copy of your 20 October comments is at Tab C.

3. Your earlier comments were aimed primarily at clarification and tightening of the language, and no effort has been made to restate the views you forwarded on 20 October.

4. As per your comments, the letter to Mr. Marsh puts you on record as opposing a ban on the detailing of intelligence personnel to the PABFIC staff.

5. Your response to Mr. Marsh is due by COB today.

/s/ Samuel V. Wilson

Samuel V. Wilson
Lieutenant General, USA
Deputy to the DCI for the
Intelligence Community

Attachments:
as stated

Distribution:

Orig. - Adsee.

1 - CS/ICS Subject

1 - CS/ICS Chrono

1 - D/DCI/IC

1 - DDCI

~~X~~ - ER

1 - IC Registry

1 -

DCI/ICS/CS/

(29 October 1975)

STAT

STAT

Executive Registry

75-8320/87

29 OCT 1975

The Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr.
Counsellor to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Jack:

Reference is your memorandum of 24 October requesting comments on its enclosed redraft of the Executive Order on the PABFIC which had been circulated some days earlier.

I note that the redraft does not reflect any of the specific changes to the 15 October draft which I had proposed in my comments forwarded 20 October, but on the assumption that my suggested amendments were considered during preparation of the redraft, I am not repeating any of them.

With respect to Section 7(a), I favor the wording as contained in the draft E.O. rather than the revision set forth in your memorandum which would ban the use of detailees on the PABFIC staff.

I do this with complete awareness that the detailee system might be subject to public and Congressional misunderstanding--but we are seeking to correct any possible misunderstanding in our contact with the House Select Committee on Intelligence, whose staff has raised an allegation of CIA "penetration" of other elements of the Government.

I cannot in good conscience recommend that intelligence professionals be excluded, in effect, from an organization such as the PABFIC staff will be.

It is my belief that the PABFIC will require a fairly large staff, since it will have two broad and quite different functions--the oversight of quality control with respect to the total performance of the Intelligence Community and inspectorate responsibilities. These two kinds of activities will require personnel of perceptibly different backgrounds and outlooks if they are to be discharged well. The PABFIC function will be enhanced by personnel who bring a background of knowledge to the staff.

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE *Ref 1*)

I-231

A ban on detailing could well cause experienced personnel who could make a valuable contribution to the PABFIC to be reluctant to join the staff. This might particularly be the case with CIA personnel who have sufficient overseas service to be covered by the CIA Retirement and Disability system, since their resignation from CIA to accept other Federal employment would end their participation in the CIARDS.

I am assuming, also, that a ban on detailing would prevent the assignment of any active duty military personnel to the PABFIC staff, which would deny the staff military experience which has been valuable in the past.

I am not aware of any evidence that Agency detailees ever have sought to influence PFIAB deliberations in a manner which could be the basis for criticism. On the contrary, I consider it is far better to have experienced personnel, well informed on how the Intelligence Community operates, detailed to the PABFIC staff than to run the risks which would be involved with a staff without such experience.

Sincerely,

/s/ Bill

W. E. Colby

Distribution:

Orig. - Adsee.

- 1 - DCI
- 1 - DDCI
- 1 - ER
- 1 - Subject File, CS/ICS (VDM)
- 1 - CS/ICS Chrono
- 1 - [redacted]
- 1 - IC Registry
- 1 - D/DCI/IC

DCI/ICS/CS, [redacted]

(29 October 1975)

27 MAR 31 05 1300
R3

UNCLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

Routing Slip

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	S/MC				
4	DDS&T		X		
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA		X		
7	DDO		X		
8	D/DCI/IC	X			
9	D/DCI/NIO		X		
10	GC		X		
11	LC		X		
12	IG		X		
13	Compt		X		
14	D/Pers				
15	D/S				
16	DTR				
17	Asst/DCI				
18	AO/DCI				
19	SC/DCI		X		
20	C/Review		X		
21	Staff				
22					
SUSPENSE		Date			

Remarks:

Response due COB 29 October. Please draft reply for DCI by 1400 hours, 29 October.

Executive Secretary

10/28/75

Date

3637 (1-75)

STAT

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FILE

STAT